

REMARKS:

Claims 1-35 were pending in the application. Claims 21-27 and Claim 33 have been amended. Claims 36-55 have been added.

Claims 15-20, 28-32, and 34-35 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims are believed moot. Applicant reserves the right to continue prosecution of these claims in a continuation application without prejudice.

Accordingly, Claims 1-14, 21-27, 33 and 36-55 are currently pending in the application.

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Liu (U.S. Patent No. 6,839,680) in view of West (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,833) and Anthias (U.S. Patent No. 4,845,644). Applicant submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest the system of amended claim 21. In the context of the previous version of claim 21, the Examiner acknowledged that Liu did not anticipate that claim. Instead, the Examiner asserted, among other things, that it would be obvious “to combine West’s ideas of using graphic interface for interfacing between communication system with online users with Liu’s system in order to provide convenient communication system for online users.” See Office Action at 9. Applicant respectfully disagrees, as there is no motivation for modifying Liu “to generate a report for said first user including said pushed content from at least two of said first plurality of business entities” and “convey, via said service, said report to said first user,” as is recited in pending claim 21.

The “invention” in Liu is “a software system that tracks and analyzes web visitors on the World Wide Web.” Liu, column 2, lines 29-30. “The visitor profile information that ProReach systems generate can be retained for the sole use and benefit of the web site that created it.” Id. at column 6, lines 13-14. Liu also states that “[i]t is possible for ProReach systems to share their user profile information,” noting that “alliances are useful to vertical markets where companies may want to work together on the world wide web.” Id. at column 6, lines 24-26. Accordingly, the “ProReach” system is designed for providing information regarding the “interest of customers” to “electronic merchants.” Id. at column 1, lines 34-38. Liu does not teach or

suggest using ProReach to “generate a report for said first user” in which the report “includ[es] pushed content from at least two of said first plurality of business entities,” much less using ProReach to “convey ... said report to said first user.” Because the focus of Liu is providing information about “web visitors” to “electronic merchants” via the ProReach system, Applicant submits one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to drastically modify Liu (via West and Anthias or otherwise) to include the missing features of claim 21, such as “generat[ing] a report for said first user including said pushed content from at least two of said first plurality of business entities.”

For at least these reasons claim 21 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art. Claim 33 and its dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art for reasons similar to those set forth for claim 21.

Newly added claim 53 is believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art. For example, Applicant submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest, among other things, “[a] computer-readable medium comprising program instructions executable by a computer to...generate a report for said first user, wherein said report includes pushed content from at least two of said first plurality of business entities,” as is recited in that claim.


Newly added claim 54 is also believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art. For example, Applicant submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest, among other things, “displaying said graphical interface, wherein said graphical interface includes a first screen that includes pushed content from at least two of said plurality of business entities, wherein said pushed content is personalized to said first user,” as is recited in that claim.

Finally, newly added claim 55 is also believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art. For example, Applicant submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest, among other things, “in response to said first user logging on to said service, display a graphical user interface that concurrently displays pushed content from at least two of said first plurality of business entities, wherein said pushed content is personalized to said first user,” as is recited in that claim.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5957-71800/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 21, 2006

By: 
Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847